

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Also, the specification has been objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the specification, the specification has been amended correspondingly.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the objection of the claims, applicants amended claims 1 and 12, the broadest claims on file, to more clearly define the present invention.

The Examiner indicated that the actuating element defined in the claims was not attached to any other structure so that its location should be properly set forth. In connection with this, it has been defined now in the independent claims that the quick chuck has clamping means for clamping the tool, and the actuating element actuates the clamping means. It is believed that therefore the actuating means is now properly defined in their cooperation with the clamping means.

The Examiner further stated that the claims set forth a clamping support force, but they did not set forth the appropriate structure which would resuscitate and/or provide the clamping force. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to define that the at least arresting means is provided for receiving a clamping support force of the clamping means (jaws and the like). It is believed that the issue related to the clamping support force has been therefore taken care of, and claims 1 and 12 are now clear with respect to the clamping support force.

The Examiner also stated that a "form-locking connection" defined in claims 1 and 12 does not have any structure for the arresting means to connect in a "form locking" manner. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to define that the arresting means 12a, 12b controllable by the control device 10a, 10b produce a form-locking connection 14a, 14b with a part of the quick chuck. It is believed that this is sufficient to deal with the issue raised by the Examiner with respect to the form locking connection.

As disclosed in particular in the middle paragraph on page 13 of the specification, through the arresting means 12a controllable by the controllable device 10a a form-locking connection 14a for receiving the clamping support forces is produced, and in particular in an axial direction between the arresting means 12a and the base body 32a. It is believed that claims 1 and 12 sufficiently define the form-locking connection of the arresting means. At the same time,

applicants added claims 13 and 14 which further define that the details of the form-locking connection between the arresting means and the base body.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is believed that claims 1 and 12 clearly and defines the present invention and patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

It is therefore respectfully submitted to allow claims 1 and 12 together with the dependent claims which depend on them and share their presumably allowable features should be considered as being in allowable condition.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

/ Michael J. Striker /

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 27233